



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 20, 2021

Mr. Kevin Bailey
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2021-22772

Dear Mr. Bailey:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 901085 (Reference No. M033847-060421).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for all records pertaining to a named individual, including specified incidents. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest

in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, however, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See* Gov't Code § 411.081(b). We also note that records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Additionally, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person does not implicate the privacy interest of the individual and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual, thus implicating the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records, other than information pertaining to specified incidents, depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the requestor also seeks information pertaining to the specified incidents; thus, this portion of the request does not require the city to compile an individual's criminal history and does not implicate the privacy interests of the named individual. Additionally, you have submitted information that does depict the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant or that pertains to routine traffic offenses. Thus, this information is not part of a criminal history compilation protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. Therefore, we will address your arguments against the disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* § 550.061 (operator's accident report), .062 (officer's accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c).

In this instance, the requestor is not a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted CR-3 accident report is confidential under section 550.065(b), and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the city to create a redacted accident report that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident report may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted CR-3 accident report. Thus, the city must generally release the redacted CR-3 accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, you have not established the information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(1). *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.¹ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Therefore, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records, other than information pertaining to the specified incidents, depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the CR-3 accident report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code, but must release the redacted CR-3 accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/jm

Ref: ID# 901085

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

² We note the information being released contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).